



Corporate Report

Clerk's Files

Originator's
Files

CD.02.COM

DATE: September 9, 2008

TO: Chair and Members of Planning and Development Committee
Meeting Date: September 29, 2008

FROM: Edward R. Sajecki
Commissioner of Planning and Building

SUBJECT: **Report on Comments - Community Uses -
Mississauga Plan Review**

RECOMMENDATION: That the report titled "Report on Comments - Community Uses - Mississauga Plan Review," dated September 9, 2008 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building recommending that the new Official Plan incorporate new and revised definitions, symbols and location criteria for community uses as proposed in Option 2, as amended, be adopted.

BACKGROUND: This report is one in a series of planning studies as part of the work program for Mississauga Plan Review. Through the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law Review and Official Plan Amendment 25 (OPA 25) to *Mississauga Plan*, community uses were identified as an outstanding issue which required further study.

In *Mississauga Plan*, community uses are defined as "...public and private services and facilities such as schools, emergency services, libraries, cultural activities, recreational activities, daycare centres, and places of religious assembly."

On February 13, 2008, City Council considered a report titled "Community Uses - Draft for Discussion - Mississauga Plan Review" dated January 15, 2008 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building which identified four options (summarized in Appendix 1)

for community use policies in the Official Plan and adopted the following:

1. That the report titled “Community Uses - Draft for Discussion - Mississauga Plan Review” dated January 15, 2008 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building be circulated to City Departments, external agencies and other stakeholders for review and comment.
2. That the letter dated February 4, 2008 from Pound & Stewart Services with respect to providing their initial comments regarding the City’s “Community Uses - Draft for Discussion - Mississauga Plan Review” corporate report be received for information and referred to staff.

The four options represent a continuum of control for the locations where community uses are permitted. They build upon one another in that the policies proposed for some options would apply to the other options as well.

The report was circulated to internal departments, the Region of Peel, the Boards of Education, Mississauga-based social service agencies, inter-faith regional networks and over 200 special interest groups, private schools, daycares and ratepayer associations for review and comment.

COMMENTS:

1. SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

Option 1 maintains the existing policies (ie. permit community uses in all land use designations except for Greenbelt, maintain restrictions for the Airport Operating Area), revises the definition of community uses and adds symbols to identify the locations of selected existing community uses.

Option 2 maintains existing policies, proposes new location and site development criteria for daycare centres and cultural activities, and refines site development criteria for private schools.

Options 3 and 4 propose the designation of community use sites and does not permit them in Residential designations. Option 3 proposes one designation for all community uses. Option 4 proposes the

designation of community use sites by use; for example, different designations are proposed for community facilities, daycares, public and private schools etc.

2. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Comments were received from internal departments, the Boards of Education, external parties, and Members of City Council. The principal issues arising from the comments are:

- the nature of community uses and the needs they address;
- the effect of the proposed policies on the evolving nature of community uses;
- the impacts of community uses - noise and traffic disruptions from new and existing community uses on the surrounding area;
- the official plan amendment process to establish community uses arising from Options 3 and 4;
- the role of underlying designations;
- site access and location of community uses;
- community uses in residential and employment districts;
- definitional issues;
- symbols on District Land Use maps;
- community impact studies;
- community uses in the LBPIA Operating Area; and
- community uses as accessory uses.

All comments are summarized in Appendix 2. Correspondence received from external parties is attached in Appendix 3.

From the comments received, there was considerable support for Options 1 and 2 as a direction for community uses in the new Official Plan. These options were supported because they:

- clarify the definition of community uses;
- address issues of compatibility relating to scale and reduce potential land use impacts;
- uphold the locational criteria;
- maintain the flexibility of the past and existing policy framework in locating community uses; and
- maintain underlying land use designations.

Options 3 and 4, which involve designating community use sites, were not supported because they:

- will increase the planning process and the requirements associated with acquiring a site specific community use designation;
- may impede development of new community uses;
- will increase the number of official plan amendments, fees and processing times for community uses;
- may impact the value of land;
- may make it difficult to determine what could be built on land by removing the underlying designation (if a community use should close);
- may restrict the supply of community uses, which, by their nature, require flexibility;
- could have implications for the services these uses provide by limiting and discouraging the establishment of community uses and requiring amendments to establish them; and
- will result in the greatest number of non-conforming sites.

3. RECOMMENDED OPTION

It is recommended that Option 2, as amended in Appendix 4, be the policy approach for community uses in the new Official Plan. This option closely follows the flexibility that has been traditionally applied to the policies for community uses in the Official Plan. This option:

- provides clarity and limits the definition of community uses to include public schools, private schools, emergency services, private clubs, community facilities, daycare centres/day programs and places of religious assembly;
- includes information symbols to identify where municipal facilities, police stations and public schools are located (as summarized in Appendix 4);
- includes site development criteria to address compatibility issues;
- maintains City Council approved designations for land use in the event a community use closes;
- permits community uses in most land use designations and directs high activity-generating community uses onto roads that can accommodate them; and
- establishes a framework for new uses which will allow community use to evolve and change to meet changing community needs.

These recommendations are consistent with the directions for the new Official Plan which is intended to direct growth in a manner that results in a built form that enhances public health, compact urban form and walkable communities. It is also consistent with the “Completing our Communities” Strategic Pillar in the proposed Strategic Plan, as well as conforming to the “complete communities” direction in Provincial Policies.

Options 3 and 4 are not recommended because they:

- reduce the flexibility as to where community uses can locate;
- will lengthen the approval process for new community uses;
- require additional financial resources to establish new community uses;
- remove the pre-determined alternative use for the lands that exists through the underlying designation in residential areas. This is a City Council approved position for the alternative use of community use lands; and
- may result in needs deficiencies in communities if new community uses have difficulty with the approval process.

4. OTHER ISSUES

a) Official Plan Conformity

Existing community uses that do not meet the policies and locational criteria will be non-conforming. If the non-conforming use ceases, then the right to operate that use will end. It is the intention that over time most non-conforming uses will cease.

b) Zoning By-Law

The definitions and locational criteria proposed in this report are consistent with the regulations in the Zoning By-law. The only amendment required is a name change for daycare/day program as detailed in earlier sections of this report and Appendix 4.

5. PUBLIC PROCESS

The public engagement for the new definitions, symbols and location criteria for community uses as proposed in Option 2 and as amended in Appendix 4 will be considered as part of the public engagement

process for the new Official Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Not applicable.

CONCLUSION: This report provides recommendations for incorporating community uses policies into the new Official Plan. The recommended option provides clarification and direction for community uses, while maintaining most of the flexibility that has traditionally been applied to these uses to meet the changing needs of the existing and future residents of Mississauga.

ATTACHMENTS:

APPENDIX 1:	Community Uses: Summary of Policy Options & Recommendations
APPENDIX 2:	Summary of Comments
APPENDIX 3:	Correspondence from External Parties
APPENDIX 4:	Summary of Recommendations

Original Signed By:

Edward R. Sajecki
Commissioner of Planning and Building
Prepared By: Emily Irvine, Policy Planner

**Appendix 1:
Community Uses: Summary of Policy Options & Recommendations**

Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Option 4:
Maintain Existing Policies - Revise Definition and Add Information Symbols	Maintain Existing Policies - Add Locational and Site Development Criteria	Designate Existing Sites and Permit Community Uses in Selected Designations	Designate by Type of Community Use
<p>Public and private services and facilities is a very broad phrase should be removed from the definition of community uses.</p> <p>The use of <i>such as</i> preceding a list of community uses should be removed from the definition of community uses.</p> <p><i>A private school</i> provides academic instruction in a full range of the subjects of the elementary or secondary school courses of study and any other educational activity is provided and may include a nursery school.</p> <p><i>A public school</i> provides academic instruction in a full range of the subjects of the elementary and secondary school courses of study, continuing education and any other educational activities are provided under the jurisdiction of the Peel District School Board, the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, the Conseil Scolaire de District Centre-Sud-Ouest or the Conseil Scolaire de District Catholique Centre-Sud.</p> <p><i>Cultural activities</i> should be defined as a social, cultural, athletic or recreational club or fraternal organization that is not operated for profit.</p>	<p>Locational criteria as follows should be applied to private schools, and daycare centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sites should be located in proximity to transit facilities or on arterial and major collector and minor collector roads, preferably at their intersections; • provision for adequate on-site parking; • acceptable ingress and egress arrangements; • adequate landscaping and buffering; • sufficient capacity in the transportation network; • adequate engineering services; • compatibility with surrounding land uses; and • a design harmonious with adjacent development. <p>Locational criteria as follows should be applied to cultural activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sites should be located in proximity to transit facilities or on arterial and major collector roads, preferably at their intersections; • provision for adequate on-site parking; • acceptable ingress and egress arrangements; • adequate landscaping and buffering; • sufficient capacity in the transportation network; • adequate engineering services; • compatibility with surrounding land uses; and • a design harmonious with adjacent development. 	<p>Establish a <i>Community Use</i> designation. Community uses are permitted in selected land use designations.</p> <p>Establish new <i>Emergency Service</i> general policies. Emergency services continue to be permitted in all land use designations.</p>	<p>Establish community use designations: <i>Community Use-Community Facilities, Community Use-Cultural Activities, Community Use-Daycare Centres, Community Use-Schools, Community Use-Private School; Community Use-Place of Religious Assembly</i></p> <p>Establish new <i>Emergency Service</i> general policies. Emergency services continue to be permitted in all land use designations.</p>

**Appendix 1:
Community Uses: Summary of Policy Options & Recommendations**

Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Option 4:
<p>A <i>community facility</i> is operated by a public authority for the provision of community activities such as, but not limited to recreation, libraries, arts, crafts, museums, social and charitable activities. This includes pools, outdoor rinks and arenas. Private gyms, banquet halls/conference centres or convention centres are not considered community uses.</p> <p><i>Daycare centres</i> provide daily temporary care of children, seniors and/or people with disabilities.</p> <p><i>Emergency services</i> means fire, emergency, police, ambulance facilities and distress centres.</p> <p>The definition of Community Uses be replaced with “Community uses are <i>private schools, public schools, emergency services, cultural activities, community facilities, daycare centres,</i> and places of religious assembly.”</p> <p>The addition of information symbols to identify selected community uses on the district land use maps.</p>			

**Appendix 2
Summary of Comments**

Respondent	Issue	Comments	Response
Peel District School Board and the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	Accessory uses	Will accessory uses on School Board sites, including daycares or the use of schools for worship, be permitted?	The Official Plan permits accessory uses on community use sites of up to 20% of the gross floor area. Notwithstanding the proposed locational criteria, this will permit a daycare or place of worship on school sites.
Pound & Stewart	Accessory uses	The report does not have a specific recommendation regarding accessory community uses.	Options 1 and 2 as recommended continue to permit accessory uses up to 20% of the gross floor area in community uses.
Pound & Stewart	Accessory uses in Employment Nodes	Function and contribution of accessory community uses to Employment Nodes would provide more balance to this report.	Neither residential nor employment nodes were examined for their specific function. This work will be undertaken as part of the Growth Management Study. This report focuses on the trends and changes in community uses and recommends policy options.
Councillors & Planning and Building	Community divisiveness	A public process through an Official Plan Amendment in relation to Options 3 and 4 could have the potential for being divisive within communities and lead to objections that are not based on land use issues.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.
Peel District School Board and the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	Community Impact Studies	Questions were raised regarding the application, requirement and role of Community Impact Studies.	Information and criteria for these studies will be addressed through a Density/Bonusing, Community Impact Studies and Community Improvement Plans Study that is not yet underway.
Councillors, Planning and Building & Blakes, Cassels & Graydon on behalf of the Islamic Society of North America/Canadian Islamic Trust Foundation	Community uses ability to meet residents changing needs	Options 3 and 4 are anticipated to reduce the flexibility of community uses to respond to community needs as they evolve and leave communities underserved. A tightly controlled designation scheme would frustrate the natural responsiveness of community uses and effect their growth and mobility in relation to the community they serve.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.

**Appendix 2
Summary of Comments**

Respondent	Issue	Comments	Response
Pound & Stewart	Community uses in Employment Districts – need for these	Community uses are needed by the employment population in employment districts. Employment Communities such as Employment Nodes and Corridors also need to achieve planned function. This requires that the services and amenities that support employment communities are also permitted and encouraged.	It is not proposed to delete community uses as a permitted use in Business Employment designations to provide flexibility to serve resident's and employees' needs.
Planning and Building	Community uses in Employment Districts – objections	Concerns were raised regarding the impacts of community uses and their effects on the functioning of employment areas.	It is not proposed to delete community uses as a permitted use in Business Employment designations to provide flexibility to serve resident's and employees' needs.
Pound & Stewart	Community uses in Nodes	Community uses are well located in Nodes	Nodes meet the locational criteria identified in Option 2.
Councillors & Pound & Stewart	Daycare Centres in the Lester B. Pearson International Airport (LBPIA) Operating Area ¹	Daycare centres as primary and accessory uses, particularly in the Gateway Employment District and Gateway Node.	The Region of Peel Official Plan and Mississauga Plan aircraft noise policies prohibit sensitive uses, such as daycare facilities and schools, in the LBPIA Operating Area. An amendment is required to the Regional Official Plan, an application for which has been received, before they can be permitted by Mississauga Plan.
Community Services	Definition of Community Facilities	Community Facilities include community centres, libraries, arenas, outdoor rinks and swimming pools operated by a public authority.	To be consistent with the new Zoning By-law, it is recommended that the definition of community facilities be amended to included facilities operated by or on behalf of a public authority.
Planning and Building	Definition of Cultural Activities	Cultural activities are defined in the Zoning By-law as private clubs.	To be consistent with the Zoning By-law and to reflect the broader nature of the uses itemized in this definition, it is recommended that cultural activities be referred to as private clubs.
Corporate Services	Definition of Daycare Centres	Daycare centres are typically associated with care facilities for children. Care centres for seniors are referred to as daycare/day program by the Province of Ontario's Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. The nomenclature of this community use should be amended to refer to daycare/day program.	It is recommended that the definition of community uses be amended to refer to daycare/day program.

¹ The Lester B. Pearson International Airport Operating Area is a large area in the north east quadrant of the City. It incorporates all or some of Malton, Northeast, Gateway, East Credit and Meadowvale Village Planning District

**Appendix 2
Summary of Comments**

Respondent	Issue	Comments	Response
Councillors	Flexibility in locational choices for community uses.	Options 3 and 4 reduce the flexibility for community uses to locate that currently exists.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.
Pound & Stewart	Gateway District Node	Gateway District Nodes – The planned form and function of this Employment Node combined with the role and function of the Hurontario Corridor, which bi-sects the node deserves special attention.	Function of Nodes within employment areas is being reviewed in the Growth Management Strategy, the Office Study and the Employment Lands Study.
Councillors	Impacts - noise disruptions - special events	Faith-based special events such as the celebration of a religious holiday can lead to noise disruptions for the surrounding community.	Outdoor noise issues, such as those that occur from outdoor events and celebrations are addressed through the Noise Control By-law 360-79, or the Nuisance Noise By-law 785-80.
Councillors	Impacts - traffic and noise disruptions – cultural activities (private clubs)	Cultural activities (private clubs), for example, have the potential to generate noise and traffic. Social gatherings and social activities which can include banquets and outdoor celebrations are, in many cases, among the reasons they have been established. The population served by cultural and social centres serve is increasingly from a broader regional area.	Outdoor noise issues, such as those that occur from outdoor events and celebrations are addressed through the Noise Control By-law 360-79, or the Nuisance Noise By-law 785-80. The proposed policies will prohibit cultural activities, redefined as private clubs, in residential designations. This is also consistent with the City’s newly adopted Zoning By-law.
Councillors	Impacts - traffic disruptions - residential areas	Community uses may cause traffic issues in established residential areas.	Option 2 directs community uses onto major roads that can accommodate the additional traffic generated by community uses. It is anticipated that the implementation of this option in the new Official Plan will, in part, alleviate future concerns of this nature.
Councillors	Impacts -noise disruptions - new community uses	New community uses may cause noise disruptions in established residential areas. Examples of these are the noise associated with outdoor play structures or the noise from bells ringing.	There are no regulations in the Zoning By-law or the Ontario Building Code that would enable the regulation of outdoor play areas. They do not require a building permit and, therefore, can not be regulated by the Zoning By-law. Outdoor noise issues, such as those that occur from outdoor events and celebrations are addressed through the Noise Control By-law 360-79, or the Nuisance Noise By-law 785-80.

**Appendix 2
Summary of Comments**

Respondent	Issue	Comments	Response
Transportation and Works & Planning and Building	Location criteria	New community uses should be encouraged to locate along major roads to minimize traffic impacts on local roads.	The proposed policies require certain community uses to locate on major roads.
Peel District School Board and the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	Locational criteria and public School Sites	Do the locational criteria proposed as part of Option 2 apply to public schools.	The locational criteria do not apply to public schools.
Peel District School Board and the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	Loss of underlying designations in relation to school sites	The loss of underlying designations of a public school sites will impede site redevelopment in a school closure scenario. There are also concerns that it would affect the sale of surplus school sites.	The designation of school sites will be retained in options 1 and 2.
Planning and Building	Nature of community uses and the needs they address	Community uses provide vital community services and meet social, religious, educational, and cultural needs of residents. The policy approach should aim to be inclusive and supportive rather than divisive.	The objectives Options 1 and 2, recommended by this report, is to maintain much of the flexibility of policies that has been applied to community uses in the past while mitigating some of the impacts from the changing nature of community uses.
Councillors, Planning and Building & Blakes, Cassels & Graydon on behalf of the Islamic Society of North America/Canadian Islamic Trust Foundation	New community uses ability to meet residents changing needs	The policies proposed as part of Options 3 and 4, are anticipated to be an obstacle toward the introduction of new community uses and the ability of existing community uses to meet residents changing needs.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.
Peel District School Board and the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	New schools in residential areas	Options 3 and 4 do not permit new public school sites on lands with residential designations without an Official Plan amendment.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.

**Appendix 2
Summary of Comments**

Respondent	Issue	Comments	Response
Councillors	Non-conforming uses	What will be the impact on existing community uses that do not conform to the new policy direction for the Official Plan recommended as a result of this study. This is particularly a concern in relation to Options 3 and 4.	Existing community uses that do not meet the policies and locational criteria will be non-conforming uses. The Official Plan permits non-conforming uses to continue to operate if the use conformed to the policies prior to the approval of the policies. If the non-conforming use ceases, then the right to operate that use will end. It is the intention that over time most non-conforming uses will cease. Options 1 and 2 will result in the fewest number of non-conforming uses.
Planning and Building	Role of underlying designations	The loss of underlying designations in Options 3 and 4 may result in a loss of employment and commercial lands. It is anticipated that a site developed for a community use is less likely to develop for alternative land uses if the community use closes.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.
Planning and Building & Transportation and Works	Site access and location of community uses	Site specific issues such as traffic conflicts, congestion and safety could be improved around community use sites.	Site access criteria and development criteria are incorporated into the proposed options to ease potential traffic conflicts.
Councillors & School Boards	Symbols	Questions arising from which symbols are used on land use maps. In some circumstances, City land use maps show open space although the site is used by a community facility and there is limited open space. In addition, will schools be illustrated by type of school? For example will elementary, middle and secondary schools be illustrated?	The District Policy Land Use Maps will include symbols for public schools (elementary, middle and secondary for the Peel District School Board); catholic schools (elementary and secondary for the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board; French schools (elementary and secondary schools for the French District Catholic School Board and Le Conseil Scolaire Public de District de Centre-Sud-Ouest); Community Facilities; Fire Stations including training facilities; and Police Stations including training facilities.

**Appendix 2
Summary of Comments**

Respondent	Issue	Comments	Response
Councillors & School Boards	Time and cost impacts of requiring redesignation of sites.	Options 3 and 4 will result in time and cost impacts of requiring a public process for new community uses through an Official Plan amendment. This may constrain new community uses by establishing an onerous process for approval.	The adoption of Options 3 and 4 is not recommended.


POUND & STEWART SERVICES

Markhamwoods Business Centre
 305 Renfrew Drive, Suite 101
 Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 9S7
 Tel: 905 305-9797 • 1-800-250-9056
 Fax: 905 305-9801
 E-mail: info@cityplan.com
 www.cityplan.com

February 4, 2008

DELIVERED

Planning and Development Committee
 300 City Centre Drive
 Mississauga, Ontario
 L5B 3C1

Attn: Members of Planning and Development Committee

**Re: Comments regarding the Draft Community Uses Report
 Mississauga Plan Review – February 2008
 City of Mississauga
 Our file: 1421**

We act on behalf of Orlando Corporation and we are pleased to submit our initial comments regarding the City's *Community Uses - Draft for Discussion Report* scheduled on February 4, 2008, Planning and Development Committee Agenda. This report affects the policy direction of the Mississauga Plan Review; which is in effect a provincial conformity review exercise in terms recent planning policy legislation.

At the outset we are focused on *accessory daycare uses* within the Gateway District Node, below the 35 NEP/NEF composite noise contour. In a broader context, it is important to also consider the City's future *community use* planning policies in terms of type of use, scale, location and site design requirements given increasing pressure to locate *community uses* within or in proximity to Employment Areas.

We have reviewed the Corporate Report and we recognize the Draft Community Uses Report is provided to generate discussion. Therefore please consider the following observations:

1. In **Section 1.0 Introduction**, the main objective of this Draft Community Uses Report ('report') appears to weigh on protecting the stability of established residential communities and to allow for the development of *community uses* to

Pound & Stewart Associates Limited



serve residential communities. This report should be strengthened by broadening its perspective to recognize that employment communities, such as Employment Nodes and Corridors, also need to achieve planned function. Achieving planned function requires that the services and amenities that support employment communities are also permitted and encouraged. This policy intent exists in Mississauga Plan today.

A more complete perspective would consider how employment communities may be more enhanced through intensification, providing a mix of supporting land uses which improve function. This supports the direction of new Provincial and Regional planning policies.

Section 2.5, Community Uses, of the Goals and Objectives in Mississauga Plan relates that the City *will provide opportunities to meet the civic, cultural, educational, recreational, religious, social and emergency service needs of its residents, employees and the traveling public, in cooperation with the appropriate public and private agencies and other levels of government.*

Therefore planning and providing *community uses* must also - on balance - satisfy the needs of *employees*, which fulfils the planned function of Employment Nodes and Corridors, for example.

2. In the context of land use designations and policy planning, the report is focused towards researching, analyzing and recommending policy options on the basis of the *community use* as a principal (free-standing) use.

While this approach can be understood, policy planning goals and objectives would be better served if this report also examined the opportunities and constraints associated with '*accessory*' *community uses*. For example, *accessory community uses*, such as *Daycare centres*, are in a position to accommodate broad diversity of *community uses* at a lesser scale, providing greater local accessibility and locational flexibility within built structures in response to the needs of working families. Discounting *accessory community uses* is counterproductive because of their adaptability and accessibility to the communities they serve.

Where *accessory community uses*, i.e. *Daycare centres*, offer childcare in Employment Nodes and Corridors it saves on parental commuting time, makes it easier for parents dependant on public transit to attend to their children as required, particularly at young ages. Corporate objectives are also fulfilled as major employers, in both governmental and private sectors are more willing to provide *in house* opportunities for *Daycare centres*. And, in the vast majority of these situations, day care centres are an *accessory use* to the permitted primary *office use* for example.



We observe that in the report there are no specific recommendations regarding *accessory community use*, i.e. *Daycare centres*. Future decisions on *accessory uses* will be determined once a policy option is chosen. In summary, it may be better to understand the important role of the *accessory community use* function as soon as possible in this policy planning process.

3. In Sections 2.1, **The Changing Nature of Community Uses** and 2.2 **The Changing Nature of the City** of the report we note that there is no reference to the evolving nature of Employment Areas in providing *community uses* that have traditionally located within residential communities. City-wide employment objectives would be better served if this Study more carefully considered the changing nature of Employment Nodes and Corridors; which currently include *community uses* and, and may be made more complete through supporting the value of certain *community uses* within Employment Nodes and Corridors.

Fortune 500 companies and their smaller supporting companies, provide a significant proportion of the employment in major Employment Nodes and Corridors. The City undertakes major efforts, as does our client, to attract high quality jobs and business opportunities to the Gateway Employment Node for example. By improving the accessibility to the *community use*, i.e. *Daycare centres* in Employment Nodes and Corridors, where public transit is available, we are encouraging less reliance on the automobile and therefore less trips. As greater demand for public transit is encouraged, the City needs to be flexible, providing higher levels of personal service opportunities in the workplace for working families and employers, and this includes *accessory community uses*.

Since major emphasis is placed in this Study on recognizing and protecting the functional impacts and land use compatibility issues associated within locating new *community uses* within existing residential communities, there is a need to more fully consider the emerging value of Employment Nodes and Corridors as logical locations, particularly where public transit usage is available, planned for improvement and encouraged.

4. We note reference is made in section 2.3.2 as follows; “...a greater number of *community uses* are locating in employment districts. A number of compatibility and safety issues can arise between *community uses* such as a daycare or school and the industrial operations in employment districts, Noise, pollution and safety issues relating to traffic, particularly truck traffic, are some of the concerns.”

These are valid points which suggest that the better location for *Daycare centres*, for example, serving higher density employment areas should be an Employment Node or Corridor. The Gateway District Node for example, is primarily comprised of low to medium-rise office buildings, having supporting employment densities and available public transit. In this context there is little or no design impact because the *Daycare centre* is an *accessory use* function, typically located within the larger office building structure.

The purpose of the study is to “conduct a comprehensive review of community uses in order to provide clarification and direction in relation to community use policies.” Therefore, to be more complete this study needs to carefully examine opportunities and constraints associated with *community uses* in Employment Nodes and Corridors.

Daycare centres serve emerging and important support functions in business communities. The ability to attract high quality corporate office investment to the Gateway District Node, a portion of the Heartland Business Community, is in part dependent on the ability to accommodate the personal and community service needs of employees.

Mississauga Plan refers to the Gateway District Node, as an Employment Node, which will support a greater intensity of employment, commercial and community facilities, which are privately and publicly accessible to the people working in this area. The planned form and function of this Employment Node, combined with the role and function of the Hurontario Corridor, which bi-sects the node, deserves special attention. The planned function of the Gateway District Node includes a concentration of employment density and a mix of land uses, including planning objectives to establish high levels of accessibility to public services and public transit facilities, among other attributes.

We note per Mississauga Plan, District Node policy Section 3.13.3, where Nodes “will act as a focus of activity for the surrounding areas at locations which are afforded good accessibility, visibility, and a relatively high level of existing and potential transit service.” Further, 3.13.3.4 (f), “community, cultural and recreational facilities should be encouraged to locate in Nodes.”

5. In section 2.3.4 **Impacts on the Area or District** reference is made to the statement, “Employment districts have provided economical land for community uses, although they may jeopardize the long term viability of these areas. Community uses occupy land which could be used for employment functions.”



This statement is absolute, but planning for complete communities should not exclude providing *accessory community uses*, such as day care centres. *Daycare Centres* not only provide employment to the owners and staff, but they also facilitate children, close to working parents.

While there may be large scale examples of *community uses* that may undermine the planned function of employment areas, this blanket statement needs to recognize the important role *accessory community uses*, such as *Daycare centres* may perform supporting the needs of working families. In this case the *accessory use day care centre* contributes to the planned function, supports employment density and public transit while establishing a more complete employment community.

6. In section **3.6 Daycare Centres**, reference is made to 150 facilities in Mississauga; where 110 “*are located in schools, offices, commercial or industrial centres.*” Therefore these locations appear to represent *accessory use* locations and this represents the vast majority of about 73 % of the total. In addition, we suggest that a number of these *day care centres* are located within or in close proximity to established and emerging district nodes.
7. In **Section 5.1 Comparative Review** we note that the zoning research and comparisons would have been helpful because, notwithstanding the complexity of other urban centre zoning by-laws, clarification would help us understand existing conditions and perhaps even trends which would determine:
 - The distribution and nature of *community uses* permitted within urban centres; i.e. residential communities and employment communities;
 - The type and scale of *community uses* that are permitted as principle uses, or as accessory uses, in Employment Nodes and Corridors of urban centres?

This information would be helpful given the thematic goals and objectives that are common to emerging Official Plans.

8. **Section 5.3 Mississauga Zoning By-law No. 0225-2007**, describes the following: “*Schools and daycares are permitted in residential zones, selected commercial zones and city centre zones, park zones and institutional zones. They are not permitted in employment zones.*”

While *Daycare centres* are not permitted as a stand alone principle use, we refer to section 8.1.2, *Accessory Uses in Employment Zones* where;

Section 8.1.2.1.1. reads; “ *In an E1 and E2 zone, permitted accessory uses shall include...day care...*”, among other uses.

And, section 8.1.2.2. reads; “ *A day care shall be permitted accessory to a permitted use in an E1 and E2 zone, subject to the provisions contained in Subsection 2.1.23 of the this By-law.*”;

(Note: E1 is defined as *Employment in Nodes*, and E2 is defined as *Employment*).

Section 2.1.23 refers as follows: *Lester B. Pearson International Airport Operating Area Restrictions*,

“*Notwithstanding any other provisions of this By-law, a day care, hospital, long term care dwelling, public school or private school shall not be permitted within the hatched area identified on Schedule 2.1.23 of this Subsection.*”

On May 25, 2004 Aird & Berlis filed an application on behalf of Orlando Corporation to amend the Region’s Official Plan (ROPA), to allow *accessory daycare uses* exemption for lands within the Gateway Node, below the 35 NEF/NEP composite contour, which are located within the LBPIA Operating Area. This application is referenced as Regional File No. ROPA 04:002. We also provided input to the OPA 25 and new Zoning By-law process which has ultimately resulted in appeals to the OPA 25 and the City’s new Zoning By-law.

Section 6.5.2 of the report reads as follows: “*There are areas of Mississauga which are subject to high levels of aircraft noise and certain development is restricted in these areas. New Development and redevelopment or infilling for daycare facilities and public and private schools is not permitted in the LBPIA Operating Area as a principal or accessory use. Despite this, redevelopment or infilling may be permitted on an individual basis in areas below specific noise levels. The policies relating to LBPIA Operating Area remain in place for each of the options outlined in this study.*”

Coincidentally the vast majority of the Gateway District Node is comprised of lands which are below the 35 NEF/NEP composite noise contour. The long term objective is to create a compact, mixed use urban form in this Employment Node

9. Notwithstanding the Airport Operating Area (AOA) restrictions of 2.1.23, *accessory use Daycares centres* could be located in facilities fronting onto all of the roads comprising the Gateway District Node, for example. Refer to *Daycare centres* under Table 2.1.9.4 and Table 2.1.9.2 (1) and per the City’s Zoning By-law No. 0225-2007.



10. We do not support the report's reference under section **5.3.2 Accessory Uses** which reads, "*Given the proportion of community uses that are multi-use centres, the proportion of accessory uses is an issue to be considered in future policy direction.*" We believe it is important to understand opportunities and constraints associated with accessory use *Daycare centres* now, particularly as it relates to *Daycare centres* for children in Employment Nodes and Corridors.
11. We refer to the report **Table 5.1 Mississauga Zoning By-law 0225-2007**, (see attached) Definitions of Community Uses, Accessory Uses and Zones where permitted. It is not understood why the reference to *Accessory Daycare* is not provided as it relates to E1 and E2 areas, as well as the cap of 20% Accessory Uses as a % of Gross Floor Area.
12. Having compared the report's **Table 5.1 Mississauga Zoning By-law 0225-2007, Definitions of Community Uses, Accessory Use and Zones where Permitted** we offer the following observation:
- The Table does not reference *Daycare* as a permitted *accessory use* in the E1 Employment in Nodes and the E2 Employment zones, notwithstanding *Accessory Use* status per the zoning by-law sections 8.1.2.1.1. and 8.1.2.2.
13. With respect to the *Daycare* definition we support the proposed broadened definition because *Daycare* can also help fulfil planned function of an Employment Node by being able to serve people with special needs, which may or may not include children.
14. The report generally describes the policy options, as determined at this time, as it relates to *community uses* as a principle use as follows:
- **Option 1:** Maintains status quo; but defines each *community use* and allow community uses in current land use designations;
- Our initial comments:** The proposed definition for *Daycare centres* is acceptable per Recommendation # 8.
- **Option 2:** Maintains existing policies but strengthens restrictions on location and site design for *Daycare centres* and cultural activities, for example. Limit *community use* locations to minimize impact on neighbouring uses, i.e. residential communities. This option recognizes the objective of the complete community per the Provincial Planning Statement and the Growth Plan but in the context of the residential communities;

Pound & Stewart Associates Limited



Our initial comments: Support the need for site plan design – functional locational criteria for *Daycare centres* and we note that the level of planning for development in an Employment Node, for example, normally satisfies all locational and site development criteria associated with *Daycare centres* as set out in Option 2: Recommendation #1. Also suggest consideration of the importance of broadened community uses in employment communities, particularly Employment Nodes.

- **Option 3:** Designate *community use* sites for free-standing *community uses* in residential designations. Where *community uses* are distinct from other land uses and locations for these uses, there is a need to protect for and determine where *community uses* are not appropriate;

Our initial comments: This Option appears to increase the planning process requirements associated with acquiring a site specific *community use* designation. Applying the process to *accessory use Daycare centres*, if this ultimately occurs, for example, should be carefully considered weighing the time and costs associated with satisfying the planning process. Opportunities for intensification and efficiency through mixed use should be encouraged.

- **Option 4:** Designate *community uses* by Type of Use introducing five new designations. This recognizes the distinctiveness of each use and will set policy regarding location and site design parameters.

Our Initial comments: The same comments apply as per Option 3. In addition, Table 6.3 Proposed Designation of Community Uses generally refers to all *community uses* as being permitted in Business Employment...designations. The reference to *community uses* as being *permitted in all land uses in designated Nodes* is not clear.

At this point we provide the foregoing opinions regarding proposed policy options, suffice to say that the role of *accessory community uses*, such as *Daycare centres*, should be more fully evaluated at the outset of this planning process. On that basis we reserve the right for further input on subsequent reports and policy proposals as they are presented.


In summary, evaluating the role, function and contribution of *accessory community uses* to Employment Nodes for example, would provide more balance in this report. We also observe that there are no specific recommendations regarding *accessory community uses*, i.e. *Daycare centres*. We recommend that it is better to understand the important role of



accessory community use functions, which may collectively have more positive and/or negative impacts on both residential and/or employment communities, than a principle *community use*, before broader policy options are finally assessed.

Should you require any further information or clarification, please contact me.

Yours truly,
Pound & Stewart Associates Limited



Phil Stewart, MCIP, RPP

la/

14211tr_Feb.04.08

Attachment: Table 5.1 Mississauga Zoning By-law 0225-2007, Definitions of Community Uses, Accessory Use and Zones where Permitted

Attachment: Comparison - Status of Community Uses in Employment Zones, City of Mississauga, prepared on behalf of Orlando Corporation

- cc. Mr. Edward Sajecki, Commissioner of Planning and Building
- cc. Mr. Leo Longo, Aird & Berlis
- cc. Mr. Gary Kramer, Orlando Corporation



N

2025-01-15 10:11:15

Table 5.1
Mississauga Zoning By-Law 0225-2007
Definitions of Community Uses, Accessory Uses and Zones where Permitted

Use	Related Definition in Zoning By-law 0225-2007	Accessory Uses (% of GFA) Gross Floor Area	Zones where Permitted*
Schools	Private schools means a building, structure or part thereof, where academic instruction in a full range of the subjects of the elementary or secondary school courses of study and any other educational activity is provided and may include a nursery school.	Tutoring, and recreational, social, community and charitable activities (20% GFA) Same accessory uses and percentage GFA in Residential Zone and Non-Residential Zones.	A private school is permitted in residential zones in selected commercial, city centre and open space zones. They are also permitted in institutional zones. Private schools are subject to the locational criteria as outlined in Schedule 2.1.9.2(1) and 2.1.9.2 (2) in Residential Zones.
	Public School means a building, structure or part thereof, where academic instruction in a full range of the subjects of the elementary and secondary school courses of study, continuing education and any other educational activities are provided under the jurisdiction of the Peel District School Board, the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, the Conseil Scolaire de District Centre-Sud-Ouest or the Conseil Scolaire de District Catholique Centre-Sud.	Tutoring, recreational, social, community and charitable activities (20% GFA)	A public school is permitted in residential zones and selected commercial, city centre and open space zones. They are also permitted in institutional zones.
X Emergency Services	Essential Emergency Service means fire, emergency, police and ambulance facilities and distress centre.	N/A	An essential emergency service is permitted in residential, office, commercial, city centre, employment zones, open space, parkway belt, utility, development, institutional, buffer zones and airport zones.
Libraries	Library means a building, structure or part thereof, operated by or on behalf of a public authority, containing printed material in various mediums for study, reference and reading.	See Recreational Activity.	See Recreational Activity
Cultural Activity Note: There is no specific reference to cultural activities in the Zoning By-	Private Club means a building, structure or part thereof, for a social, cultural, athletic or recreational club or fraternal organization that is not operated for profit.	Not included with the uses permitted in all zones	Private clubs are permitted in selected commercial and employment zones.

Table 5.1
Mississauga Zoning By-Law 0225-2007
Definitions of Community Uses, Accessory Uses and Zones where Permitted

Use	Related Definition in Zoning By-law 0225-2007	Accessory Uses (% of GFA) Gross Floor Area	Zones where Permitted*
Place of Religious Assembly	<p>children, seniors and/or disabled persons.</p> <p>Place of Religious Assembly means a building, structure or part thereof that is used as a place of public worship.</p>	<p>Tutoring and a commercial school (20% of the GFA)</p> <p>A community/multi-use hall used for recreational, social, community and charitable activities within a place of religious assembly (Equal to or less than the GFA of the worship area)</p> <p>Same accessory uses and percentage GFA in Residential Zone and Non-Residential Zones.</p>	<p>Zones.</p> <p>A place of religious assembly is permitted in residential zones and in selected commercial, city centre, and open space zones. Places of religious assembly are also permitted in employment and institutional zones. Places of religious assembly are subject to the locational criteria outlined in Schedule 2.1.9.3(1) and 2.1.9.3 (2) in Residential Zones.</p>

* Note: Does not include exception zones.

4. Conclusion

The discussion in this section has focused on some of the definitional issues relating to community uses and the zones where uses are permitted. The following section presents four policy options that attempt to address the issues outlined in this study. The implications for zoning regulations are also briefly discussed in relation to the policy options.

Comparison—Current Status of Community Uses in Employment Zones, City of Mississauga.
Prepared on behalf of Orlando Corporation

Mississauga Plan—Post OPA No. 25		
Use	Definition per 7. Glossary	Permitted
Community Use	means public and private services and facilities such as schools, emergency services, libraries, cultural activities, recreational activities, day care centres, and places of religious assembly but does not include <i>residential dwellings</i> and special housing.	3.19.2.1 <i>Community uses</i> are permitted in all land use designations, except Greenbelt. Notwithstanding the forgoing, <i>development, infilling and redevelopment</i> for public and private schools, day care facilities and hospitals, will not be permitted as a principal or accessory use within the LBPIA Operating Area except for those parts of the East Credit, Malton and Meadowvale Village Districts within the LBPIA Operating Area below the 35 <i>NEP/NEF Composite Noise Contour</i> , subject to the aircraft noise policies of this Plan. (MPA-25)
schools, emergency services, libraries, cultural activities, recreational activities, day care centres, and places of religious assembly.	No Specific definitions. All are included under "Community Use"	Business Employment permitted uses: 3.3.1.1 e) community uses, provided that public and private schools, day care facilities, hospitals, and nursing homes will not be permitted as a principal or accessory use within the LBPIA Operating Area;

Mississauga Zoning By-law 0225-2007		E1 Employment in Nodes	E2 Employment	E3 Industrial
Use	Definition	Permitted in Principal/ Accessory	Permitted in Principal/ Accessory	Permitted in Principal/ Accessory
Community Use	No definition			
Community Athletic Field	means an outdoor area operated on or behalf of a public authority for the provision of athletic and leisure activities.	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO
Community Centre	means a building, structure or part thereof, operated by or on behalf of a public authority for the provision of community activities, such as, but not limited to, recreation, arts, crafts, museums, social and charitable activities.	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO
Community Garden	means an outdoor space used to grow and care for vegetables, flowers and/or annual plantings for personal consumption or non-commercial purposes excluding trees, shrubs or permanent landscaping features.	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO
Cultural Activities	See Report Section regarding "Private Club"			
Day Care	means a building, structure or part thereof, with or without an outdoor play area, used for temporary care which does not exceed twelve (12) consecutive hours in one (1) day, of more than five (5) persons. Care may be provided for children, seniors and/or disabled persons.	NO/YES*	NO/YES*	NO/NO
Essential Emergency Services	means fire, emergency, police and ambulance facilities and distress centre.	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO
Group Home	means a supportive housing facility located within a detached dwelling that is occupied by four (4) to eight (8) persons, exclusive of staff and/or receiving family, who live as a unit under responsible supervision consistent with the requirements of its occupants, which may or may not be licensed or approved by the Province of Ontario, but excludes a supportive housing facility that provides accommodation and care for any other purpose including the observation, detention and rehabilitation of offenders or ex-offenders.	NO/NO	NO/NO	NO/NO
Hospital	means a building, structure or part thereof, used for the treatment of persons afflicted with sickness, disease, injury or the treatment of convalescent or chronically ill persons.	NO/NO	NO/NO	NO/NO
Libraries	means a building, structure or part thereof, operated by or on behalf of a public authority, containing materials in various mediums for study, reference and reading.	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO
Nursing Homes	No definition			
Place of Religious Assembly	means a building, structure or part thereof, that is used as a place of public worship.	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO
Recreational Establishment	means a building, structure or part thereof, designed and equipped to be used for athletic and leisure activities and may include such facilities as a fitness centre, racquet club, billiard hall, bowling alley, arena, curling rink, indoor facility used for golf, baseball or soccer, indoor playground.	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES
Schools – Private and Public	Private School means a building, structure or part thereof, where academic instruction in a full range of the subjects of the elementary or secondary school courses of study and any other educational activity is provided, and may include a nursery school. Public School means a building, structure or part thereof, where academic instruction in a full range of the subjects of the elementary or secondary school courses of study, continuing education and any other educational activities are provided under the jurisdiction of the Peel District School Board, the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, the Conseil Scolaire de District Centre-Sud-Ouest, or the Conseil Scolaire de District Catholique Centre-Sud.	NO/NO	NO/NO	NO/NO

* 2.1.23 Lester B. Pearson International Airport (LBPIA) Operating Area Restrictions Notwithstanding any other provisions of this By-law, a day care, hospital, long-term care dwelling, public school or private school shall not be permitted within the hatched area identified on Schedule 2.1.23 of this Subsection.



Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Patent & Trade-mark Agents
199 Bay Street
Suite 2800, Commerce Court West
Toronto ON M5L 1A9 Canada
Tel: 416-863-2400 Fax: 416-863-2653

April 14, 2008

Gerald S. Swinkin
Partner
Dir: 416-863-5845
gerald.swinkin@blakes.com

VIA E-MAIL

Reference: 53695/00001

Ms. Emily Irvine
Policy Planning Division
Planning and Building Department
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

**Re: Community Uses/Mississauga Plan Review
Islamic Society of North America/Canadian Islamic Trust Foundation**

Dear Ms. Irvine:

Thank you for sending along the notice of the review of Community Uses initiative to our client. We have represented ISNA/CITF in connection with two of their properties and facilities in Mississauga, the Islamic Centre and Secondary School at 2200 South Sheridan Way and the private school on Sherway Drive. As you can appreciate, our client does have an interest in the outcome of this review.

We have taken the opportunity of reviewing the Planning Department report dated January 15, 2008 and the Community Uses – Draft for Discussion paper referenced in it.

Of the options under consideration, our client believes Option 1 to be the most appropriate course of action in this review and would recommend that Council pursue that option.

While maintaining locational criteria to address potential impacts from places of religious assembly and schools, this approach preserves the flexibility which is inherent in the current structure.

As is correctly pointed out in the Findings Section 2.4 of the draft, community uses are an integral part of the community and are ever evolving. The uses evolve with the patterns and demographics of neighbourhoods and the community at large. Adopting a tightly controlled designation of use scheme is more likely to inhibit the natural responsiveness of these uses to their community and will frustrate the growth and mobility of these uses.


21758467.1

Blakes

Page 2

As our client is interested in this review and its outcome, in order to ensure that they have the benefit of ongoing developments and an opportunity to be heard in the process, please place me on your mailing list to receive further reports and documents from the Planning Department and any notice of proceedings on the issue before Council and its committees.

Yours very truly,



Gerald S. Swinkin

GSS:cas

c: M. D. Khalid

April 14, 2008

Ms. Emily Irvine
Policy Planning Division
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

PLANNING & BUILDING RECEIVED				
APR 16 2008				
Division	Action	Location	Info	Seen
Comm				
Built				
Pub				JE
Dep				

*Don
EL - ps acknowledge*

Dear Ms. Irvine:

RE: **Community Uses – Draft for Discussion
Mississauga Plan Review**

Thank you for providing the Peel District School Board with the opportunity to provide input on the above noted document. Based on its review the Board has the following comments.

Option 1

The Board has no comment on the definition of a public school as it is consistent with Zoning By-law definition.

This option still allows the Board the flexibility of being able to locate in all land designations except greenbelt. In addition there is an underlying designation which provides context for the City, residents and developers on what could be built on the land.

Option 2

The site criteria associated with this option does not apply to public schools and this would need to be clearly specified in any document.

Wording would also be required to explain that public schools are exempt from the locational requirements and are permitted to locate in all land designations except greenbelt.

Option 3

While the Board's existing schools would be designated a "community use" and would conform with the intent of this option, new schools would not be permitted in residential areas. To acquire a new school site in a residential area, not previously designated, the Board would require an Official Plan Amendment, this would add time and expense to the process of acquiring the land to build a school.

This option also limits the Board's flexibility to acquire new school sites in a built area if designations have already been determined, again requiring the Board to go through the Official Plan Amendment process.

Trustees

Janet McDougald, Chair
Ruth Thompson, Vice-Chair
Valerie Arnold-Judge
Beryl Ford
David Green
Steve Kavanagh

Brad MacDonald
Suzanne Nurse
Don Stephens
Allison Van Wagner
Jeff White
Rick Williams

Director of Education and Secretary
Jim Grieve

**Associate Director,
Instructional Support Services**
Judith Nyman

**Associate Director,
Operational Support Services**
Wayne McNally

Also there is no underlying designation if a school closes, this makes it difficult for the City, residents and developers to determine what could be built on the land.

The Board does have the right to expropriate land for a school and has the ability to use this process to acquire a new site if so required.

The Board does not support this option.

Option 4

The comments in Option 3 apply here with the only difference in this option being that schools would be identified as "Community Use-School".

The Board does not support this option.

Additional Issues

With respect to the Community Impact Studies, before the Board can provide any further comments on this it would need to know if the study will be used for public school sites. If so, what would the study entail, who would request one and would any recommendations be binding. Does this study mean the City would have input in what the Board could do with a surplus school site. The Board is governed by Ministry of Education regulations, and has its own policies and requirements to meet when dealing with surplus school sites.

In conclusion the Board would prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as it retains the ability to locate a school in all land designations except greenbelt, there is the underlying designation and the Board does not have to go through the Official Plan Amendment process for a new school site as required in Options 3 and 4.

If you require any further information please contact me at 905-890-1010, ext. 2217.

Yours truly,



Paul Mountford, MCIP RPP
Intermediate Planning Officer
Planning and Accommodation Dept.

- c. S. Hare, Peel District School Board
- J. Rogers, Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board

EI



Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board

40 Matheson Boulevard West, Mississauga, Ontario L5R 1C5 • Tel: (905) 890-1221 • Fax: (905) 890-7610

May 12, 2008

Emily Irvine
Policy Planning Division
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

**Re: Community Uses – Draft for Discussion
Mississauga Plan Review**

PLANNING
COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
Division
Comm
Div
Pol
Dev
Strat
Bus. Dev

Handwritten initials: JC, AB, EI

Dear Emily Irvine:

We are in receipt of the Planning and Building Report entitled Community Uses – Draft for Discussion. We have reviewed the document and provide the following comments.

Option 1

Option 1 provides the Board with the most flexibility to locate in all land designations except for Greenbelt. Furthermore, should a school close, there is an underlying designation which provides context for the City, residents and developers with respect to how the land could be developed.

The Board has no objection to the addition of information symbols to identify existing public schools, community facilities and future school sites on the district land use maps in the Official Plan. The Board requests that a disclaimer be included with regard to the identification of the future school sites, indicating that if the school site is not needed, that the underlying zoning would apply.

Under the definition of *public school*, the word “are” should be removed after “educational activities”.

The Board supports Option 1.

Option 2

Locational and site development criteria will not apply to public schools, therefore, this should be clearly indicated in any documents. It should also be explained that public schools are permitted to locate in all land designations except for greenbelt.

Furthermore, should a school close, there is an underlying designation which provides context for the City residents and developers with respect to how the land could be developed.

The Board supports Option 2.

Option 3

While the Board's existing public schools would be designated as Community Use, and would conform to the intent of this option, new schools would not be permitted in residential areas. As stated in the Community Uses – Draft for Discussion report, "Public schools are intended to serve a local population", therefore public schools should be permitted in residential areas, where the population that would use the public schools reside.

In addition, for school boards to acquire a new school site that was not previously designated, Boards would require an Official Plan Amendment which would be time consuming and expensive.

Furthermore, should a school close, there is no underlying designation to provide context for the City residents and developers with respect to how the land could be developed. This option removes the current approved rights of the Board to redevelop the lands with respect to the lands' underlying designations. The lack of an underlying designation or alternate use for the land would have a negative impact on the value of the property.

The Board does not support Option 3.

Option 4

Comments from Option 3 apply to Option 4. In addition, the Board would request that the "Community Use – Schools" designation be divided to differentiate between public schools and private schools because the locational criteria applies to private schools, and not public schools.

The designation of community uses by type of use severely impedes the redevelopment of the lands, should the school close. Furthermore, this option would not permit daycare facilities within a public school. Official Plan Amendments would increase, and the effect of fees and processing times could discourage the introduction of new uses or community uses.

The Board does not support Option 4.

Additional Issues:

Community Impact Studies: The Board requires more detailed information regarding the Community Impact Study before additional comments can be provided. As stated in the Community Uses Report, "there are a number of issues which would need to be addressed in relation to Community Impact Studies, including: the scope of the review; who would undertake the study; what would trigger the request for a study; and, who would review the study".

Will Community Impact Studies be applied to public school sites? Would any recommendations put forth in a Community Impact Study be binding, and how would it impact School Board level decisions? The School Boards are governed by Ministry of Education regulations and guidelines, and has its own policies and requirements when dealing with surplus school sites.

In conclusion, the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board supports Options 1 and 2 as described in the Community Uses-Draft for Discussion report. Both of these options allow the School Boards to locate in all land designations except for greenbelt, in particular, schools can be located in residential areas, where public schools would best serve the community. Second, should a school close, these options maintain the currently approved underlying designations that would provide context for the City, residents and developers with respect to how the land can be redeveloped. Finally, School Boards would not have to go through a lengthy and costly Official Plan Amendment process for a new school site, as would be required in Options 3 and 4.

If you require any additional information, please contact me at 905-890-0708, extension 24299.

Yours truly,



Joanne Rogers, MCIP, RPP

Planner

Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board

- c. T. Munn, DPCDSB
- S. Hare, PDSB
- P. Mountford, PDSB

**Appendix 4:
Summary of Recommendations**

Issue	Recommendation	Zoning Change
Cultural Activities Locational Parameters	That cultural activities (private clubs) not be permitted in residential designations.	None
Symbols on District Maps	<p>That the following existing and proposed community uses be represented with symbols in the District Policy Land Use Maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public schools – elementary, middle and secondary for the Peel District School Board; • catholic schools – elementary and secondary for the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board; • French schools – elementary and secondary schools for the French District Catholic School Board and Le Conseil Scolaire Public de District de Centre-Sud-Ouest. • Community Facilities; • Fire Stations including training facilities; and • Police Stations including training facilities. 	None
Community Use Description	That the following be added to the community use policies: <i>“Generally, new community uses be encouraged to locate along major roads to minimize traffic impacts on the local roads.”</i>	None
Definition for Community Facilities	That the definition for <i>community facilities</i> be amended as follows: <i>“A community facility is operated by or on behalf of a public authority for the provision of community activities such as, but not limited to, recreation, libraries, arts, crafts, museums, social and charitable activities. This includes pools, outdoor rinks and arenas. Private gyms, banquet halls/conference centres or convention centres are not considered community facilities.”</i>	None
Nomenclature and definition for Cultural Activities	That the former reference to <i>cultural activities</i> be changed to <i>private clubs</i> .	None
Nomenclature for Daycare centres	That the nomenclature for <i>daycare centres</i> be amended to <i>daycare/day program</i> .	Change to the nomenclature for Daycare Centre to <i>daycare/day program</i> .
Community Uses Definition	That the definition for community uses be revised to refer to cultural activities and daycare/day program as follows: Community uses are <i>public schools, private schools, emergency services, private clubs, community facilities, daycare/day program</i> and places of religious assembly.	None